



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

ences that grow out of a desire for the exclusive control of the resources and markets of annexed territories. To cite a single example: Because of the shortage of petroleum, its constantly increasing commercial importance, and the continuing necessity of replenishing the world's supply by drawing upon the latent resources of undeveloped regions, it is of the highest importance to apply to the petroleum industry the most enlightened principles recognized by nations as appropriate for the peaceful ordering of their economic relations.

This government finds difficulty in reconciling the special arrangement referred to in paragraphs 18 and 19 of your note, and set forth in the so-called San Remo Petroleum Agreement, with your statement that the petroleum resources of Mesopotamia, and freedom of action in regard thereto, will be secured to the future Arab State, as yet unorganized. Furthermore, it is difficult to harmonize that special arrangement with your statement that concessionary claims relating to those resources still remain in their pre-war position, and have yet to receive, with the establishment of the Arab State, the equitable consideration promised by His Majesty's Government.

This government has noted in this connection a public statement of His Majesty's minister in charge of petroleum affairs to the effect that the San Remo agreement was based on the principle that the concessions granted by the former Turkish Government must be honored. It would be reluctant to assume that His Majesty's Government has already undertaken to pass judgment upon the validity of concessionary claims in the regions concerned, and to concede validity to certain of those claims which cover, apparently, the entire Mesopotamian area. Indeed, this government understands your note to deny having taken, and to deny the intention to take, any such *ex parte* and premature action. In this connection, I might observe that such information as this government has received indicates that prior to the war the Turkish Petroleum Company, to make specific reference, possessed in Mesopotamia no rights to petroleum concessions or to the exploitation of oil; and in view of your assurance that it is not the intention of the mandatory power to establish on its own behalf any kind of monopoly, I am at some loss to understand how to construe the provision of the San Remo agreement that any private petroleum company which may develop the Mesopotamian oil fields "shall be under permanent British control."

#### Question of Motives

Your lordship contracts the present production of petroleum in the United States with that of Great Britain and some allusion is made to American supremacy in the petroleum industry. I should regret any assumption by His Majesty's Government or any other friendly power that the views of this government as to the true character of a mandate are dictated in any degree by considerations of the domestic need or production of petroleum or any other commodity.

I may be permitted to say, however, for the purpose of correcting a misapprehension which your note reflects, that the United States possesses only one-twelfth approximately of the petroleum resources of the world. The oil resources of no other nation have been so largely drawn upon for foreign needs, and your lordship's statement that any prophecies as to the oil-bearing resources of unexplored and undeveloped countries must be accepted with reserve, hardly disposes of the scientific calculation upon which, despite their problematical elements, the policies of States and the anticipations of world production are apparently proceeding. The Government of the United States assumes that there is a general recognition of the fact that the requirements for petroleum are in excess of production, and it believes that opportunity to explore and develop the petroleum resources of the world wherever found should without discrimination be freely extended, as only by the unhampered development of such resources can the needs of the world be met.

But it is not these aspects of oil production and supply, in so far as they are of domestic interest to the United States, with which I am concerned in this discussion. I have alluded to them in order to correct confusing infer-

ences, liable to arise from certain departures, which I believe I discern in your lordship's communication, from the underlying principles of a mandate, as evolved and sought to be applied by the allied and associated powers to the territories, brought under their temporary dominion, by their joint struggle and common victory. This dominion will be wholly misconceived, not to say abused, if there is even the slightest deviation from the spirit and the exclusive purpose of a trusteeship as strict as it is comprehensive. Accept, My Lord, the assurances of my most distinguished consideration.

BAINBRIDGE COLBY,

Secretary of State of the United States of America.

## INTERNATIONAL NOTES

WAR CAUSES VAST MIGRATIONS of civilians and survivors of the fray. Denudation of home territory, wrecking of industries, scarcity of sustenance, and impending burdens of taxation if men remain where they are—these causes provoke emigration to more favored lands; and, as present figures show, nothing but difficulties in getting passports and transportation and the right to enter new lands across seas is preventing an exodus from Europe to the Americas such as never has been seen in the past. Much of this planned for transplanting of peoples will be state-sanctioned. The Poles, for instance, are only too glad to get rid of the hordes of Gallician Jews. Italy, with her past experience in mind, welcomes settlement of her sons abroad, knowing how much of their earnings comes back home. Germany has a surplus population of 12,000,000 to feed. All the governments wish to get rid of their diseased, crippled, and defective folk. Hence they expedite the exoduses.

To meet this incoming flood and check it, Canada, by an order in council, has just decreed that all artisans, mechanics, and laborers other than farm laborers seeking admission must possess \$250 in their own right and have transportation to their destination. Tourists, farmers, and domestic servants are not touched by the new regulation. Canada's restrictions always have been more rigid than those of the United States, and she has not had to face, as yet, any marked variation from colonization by North of Europe races, though Jews are growing in number rapidly in and about Montreal.

In the United States, the first day that Congress opened, December 6, the House Committee on Immigration reported favorably on a bill, introduced by its chairman, forbidding admission of aliens for two years, the bill to become effective 60 days after its enactment. Blood relatives of naturalized aliens are exempted.

The American Federation of Labor is supporting this restrictive legislation.

"CANCELLATION" OF ORDERS FOR GOODS has gone on to such a degree as between the merchants and manufacturers of different countries, and also within nations as between wholesalers and retailers, that the phenomenon has become a recognized form of war "by-product." The chancelleries of the nations are wrestling now with charges brought by one set of nationals against another group. The International Chamber of Commerce has been forced to deal with the problem, and the Chamber

of Commerce of the United States already has taken action through its committees. On every hand there has been a disposition to lower standards of "honor" and to crawl out of obligations. Just what the remedy must be is defined in the report of a subcommittee of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, recently published. It says:

First. That the practice is the result of war-time irregularities and will pass as we return to a normal basis.

Second. That we are now reaping the results of the loose business practices inaugurated before the war, when many lines were in a state of over-production and the measures taken to unload this surplus were demoralizing. Those entertaining this belief feel that the remedy is in a general reformation of our system of order-taking, making each order a contract enforceable by law.

Third. That we have been drifting away from the fundamentals of sound business and the "Golden Rule," and that we must return to a stronger belief in the rights of others, and a higher regard for our own integrity, if the change is to be permanent.

FRANCE AND THE VATICAN have been drawn closer together by the common experiences of the war and its aftermath. The valor and self-sacrifice of the priests who succored the troops and the entire loyalty to the national cause of the upper clergy prominent in ecclesiastical politics have accounted for the change from the governmental side. On the part of the Vatican there has been gratitude for the aid of France in Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Syria and sections of the Near East, where church interests have been protected. Moreover, relations between France and the Roman Catholics of the Rhenish provinces and of Bavaria have become intimate in a common enterprise to shake off Prussian domination of the Germany of tomorrow. The Chamber of Deputies, by a vote of 397 to 209, December 1, voted to re-establish the French Embassy in Rome and to receive a Papal Nuncio in Paris. The size of the minority opposing this action indicates that the strictly secular party is still strong. What the Senate will do remains to be seen. There the anti-clerical forces are more strongly entrenched.

SCIENCE, LABOR, AND LAW are to have a much closer connection than formerly. The formation in the United States of a federated society of engineers, with a membership of 80,000 persons, which already has assumed, under the presidency of Mr. Hoover, the special task of investigating economic and labor problems in the light of engineering standards and professional ideals of efficiency, is a sign of the times. Nor should the fact be overlooked that the American Federation of Labor plans to co-operate with this engineering society, having now overcome its former opposition to "scientific" conduct of business and industry. As a foretaste of the new era that lies ahead, the vote taken by the Taylor Society of New York City, following a conference with representative officials of the national organizations of the mechanical and electrical engineers of the country, may be cited. Discussion had been centered on the "12-hour shift in the steel industry of the United

States." The expert, whose paper dealt exhaustively with the evidence in the case, had contended for a shorter day. The difficulties of competition with nations having varying standards of legal labor days had been dwelt upon. Therefore the Taylor Society decided to give the investigation a wider range than had been first proposed. They selected an organ of the League of Nations, one that some persons consider its most commendable agency. The text of their vote is appended:

Whereas the profession of management engineering views as uneconomic and inefficient the two-shift or average twelve-hour day in industry; and

Whereas we welcome the widespread effort to increase production by a considered shortening of the hours of labor; and

Whereas the steel industry in the United States, with its large percentage of workers engaged the long day, offers an inviting field for investigation and readjustment; and

Whereas during the last few years the leading steel-producing nations of the world, with the exception of the United States, have abandoned the two-shift day and there is now available a mass of information as to the effect under varying conditions of the three-shift day:

*Resolved*, That the Taylor Society, in annual meeting assembled, request the governing body of the International Labor Office to place the subject of the long day in the steel industry on the agenda of the International Labor Conference of 1922.

THE EUROPEAN RELIEF COUNCIL, with Mr. Herbert Hoover at its head, has been formed during the past month, for the sensible purpose of co-ordinating the operations, administrative and altruistic, of eight agencies laboring in Europe and relying for their support on American donors. In the council are the Red Cross, the Near East Relief, the Y. M. C. A., the K. of C., and other well-known associations with a splendid war and post-war record. Their total estimated budget is put at \$23,000,000, and it is this sum which the Council is now appealing to the country to raise. Much of this sum—indeed, most of it—will be spent on saving the children of the lands where the American workers go; and it is this particular phase of the enterprise that has made Pope Benedict XV a friend of the cause and a promoter of gifts to it from Roman Catholics. The following extract from his letter, transmitted through Cardinal Gibbons, is worth reprinting, partly because of its estimate of Mr. Hoover and partly for its statement of facts of which the eminent Italian and pontiff is aware. The Pope wrote:

The splendid services you already have rendered in this regard, which assure you without doubt an abiding place in the history of Christian charity and give you a unique title to the gratitude of the people, fill us alike with heartfelt satisfaction and consolation at the prospect of the great good that will thus accrue to the needy multitudes of Europe.

We have learned that you are now devoting your time and earnest endeavor in a special way in behalf of the suffering little ones. What you did to succor the helpless children of Belgium when the utter lack of proper food threatened their frail lives—all this is still fresh and living in our memory.

At that time we were moved to lift up our voice in praise of your noble initiative, and we are all the more disposed to do so now in view of the fact that it is no longer a question of saving the lives of the children of one nation alone, but rather, as we are credibly informed, of three million children belonging to various nations of Europe.

RENEWAL OF THE ANGLO-JAPANESE ALLIANCE last July was automatic and for a limited time. The issue of formal and enduring re-establishment of this compact is now before the statesmen of the two empires, with the British Foreign Office in steady receipt of information showing that opposition against such action is steadfast in the Australasian and North American portions of the empire and also among British traders in the Far East. China, also, is not failing to let Great Britain know that any desire the latter may have for retaining her traditional influence in the republic may be defeated if Britain allies herself with China's foes, cases being cited by Peking indicating that such formal relations with Japan do hamper the British Government at times when it would naturally come to the relief of China. British opponents of the renewal also point to the possibility that close ties with Japan will not facilitate the best sort of understanding between Great Britain and the United States, and that therefore, for that reason, if for no other, Japan should be set aside. The British Government undoubtedly will act with imperial interests in view, not omitting to note certain contingencies in which Japan's aid might be valuable in the fight against Russian proletarianism that is being so shrewdly preached throughout Asia, in Japanese, British, and other foreign controlled territory. Czaristic Russia, against which Great Britain and Japan originally united under treaty pledges, has gone; but another régime, quite as autocratic and vastly more aggressive and insidious, has taken its place, and both Great Britain and Japan have to reckon with a force that may drive them together to protect governments and peoples that they do not wish to see turned communistic in theory but proletarian and autocratic in form.

VICE IS INTERNATIONAL in its range of appeal and action, and when in its complicated problems of emigration and settlement of the more fortunate portions of the world it takes on portentous forms. To illustrate: Toma Jonneau, brother of the former Premier of Rumania and now head of Rumania's delegation to the League's Assembly, has made a special report to the League Council on the "white slave" traffic as affected by the war. It is based on an authorized investigation by him made for the League. He found that exportation and importation of immoral women had ceased during the war, owing to stiff passport regulations; but he said that with the armistice came a resumption of the traffic on a wholesale scale, owing in part to the excess of women over men in Europe and also because of the breakdown of morale, which made young girls an easier prey for "slavers." He said that open markets for the purchase of women now existed in the Near East, and that the girls there bought were finding their way

first to Europe and then to America. He calls upon the League to act in the premises, and he urges an international conference to deal with the problem as soon as possible.

GERMAN SCHOLARS AND SCIENTISTS recently sent to Yale University an appeal for restoration of former relations between the two groups of investigators. President Hadley turned the communication over to the Institute of International Education, with headquarters in New York City, an organization which has for one of its aims the creation of formal and mutually satisfactory relations between the university and college men of the nations. The attitude of the scientists of the United States toward German scientists, at the present time, is probably accurately expressed in the following letter to the *New York Times*:

Concerning the invitation extended by the fifty-seven Oxford professors to renew at once the old personal relationships, your editorial article of today and the article reprinted from the *London Times* represent very precisely the views of most American scientists. The prevailing American policy of delay is not based upon hate in any degree, but upon duty. I am not aware that hatred of Teutonic scholars exists in any American community of scholars. I think we are above that. Exchange of publications with Teuton scientists is under way and will soon reach pre-war dimensions. It is a question merely of resuming intimate personal relationships. The manifesto issued late in 1914 by ninety-three intellectual leaders of Germany, especially in the light of Prof. Wilhelm Ostwald's Stockholm interview on why Germany went into the war, made a bad impression in this country, and no adequate retraction has been forthcoming. Letters received from our German colleagues since the signing of the armistice show no evidence of contrite hearts, but only bitterness that Germany was defeated, not on the battlefield, but in the Peace Conference.

A leading Swedish scientist, who thoroughly understands German universities and would not consciously misrepresent them, recently wrote, for publication: "Every German believed [in 1914] that war would be cheaper than the maintenance of the vast and rapidly growing military establishments." Should we compromise with and overlook that sort of thing? Should we forget that Germany defeated the proposal of the other great nations at the second Hague Conference, in 1907, to reduce armaments by diplomatic agreement?

Last year Professor Foerster, of Munich, was quoted all over the world as saying: "We Germans have only ourselves to blame for the moral blockade which surrounds us, and the removal of that blockade depends upon ourselves alone." The representatives of the allied nations who organized international scientific societies at Brussels in July, 1919, have said, again and again, officially and otherwise, that the Teutonic scholars would be received into fellowship as soon as, and no sooner than, the outrageous Prussian views on international political relations are thrown overboard. The next step is not for us to take.

W. W. CAMPBELL,  
Director Lick Observatory, University of  
California, Chairman of American Delegation to Brussels Conference, 1919.

IN TERRITORY FORMERLY TURKISH, but assigned to the powers, providing it remains in the hands of "infidels," change of title to the British, French, Greek, and Jewish governments will mean a striking extension of the activities of archaeologists and of all delvers into the history of the past. Explorations already have begun under new concessions that promise to be astonishingly rewarding. Enterprises operating under the rather limited concessions of the Turks given prior to the war are resuming operations. The whole world of scholars is agog with anticipation, and some of the spoil already has found its way to this country and to western Europe, never to return, come what may in the Near East. In Palestine, naturally, there is much expectation of rare "finds," and Sir Herbert Samuel, the High Commissioner, already has placed in charge of a society specially created for the task the care of all monuments, guarding of all sites, and watchfulness as to exportation of ancient objects, the same being now forbidden by the law of the new State.

SECRETARY COLBY, OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, with a suite including high military and naval and civilian attachés, left Washington December 3, for a brief trip to Brazil, Uruguay, and Argentina. In Brazil and Uruguay his errand will be to take the place of President Wilson in formally returning the visits recently made on President Wilson by the heads of those States. In Argentina he will be a spokesman for the goodwill of the Republic of the North toward the rich and powerful State on La Platte River. He was sent on his way by formal exercises held at the Pan-American Union Building, where he and Ambassador Mathieu, of Chile, exchanged formal and fraternal addresses. The Chilean diplomat said:

You will carry to the peoples and governments before whom you will represent the eminent President of the United States the eloquent expression of a policy which has created new and broader horizons of peace and at the same time strengthened on our American continent those sentiments of mutual confidence and solidarity which the American people have inspired by reason of a moral elevation superior to their material greatness.

And in addition to all this, my dear Mr. Colby, you are going to make hosts of friends among nations open to the influence of noble sentiments, and among those sentiments there is none which is more highly appreciated than the sincerity which so markedly characterizes your personality.

We desire, sir, that you carry with you for the success of your great mission the warm wishes which are here expressed by the representatives of the American nations seated around the table. Combined with these warm wishes there goes with you the affectionate regard of each and every one of us, who feels proud to be considered among your friends.

Secretary Colby said:

I do not know that there is anything that the President feels more deeply than the sense he has of South America's appreciation of the great ends and the great ideals he has sought to conserve and promote.

I only wish that the American people could have a voice and a personality which would more adequately embody and bring to your people the great common interest that is felt

in the United States for her sister republics of America. You must have appreciated that there is not an audience in the United States where you have found yourselves unappreciated or a lack of enthusiasm and interest for your countries.

You can scan the utterances of our public men and can find nothing but evidences of goodwill, interest, and admiration which is felt in this country for your people. Most of us do not differ fundamentally. Cultivation and honor have no meridians or latitude. A gentleman, a man of honor, a man of faith, a man of conscience, is the same thing the world over. Civilization is in the custody and guardianship of such men in all the countries that belong to the corporate body of the Pan-American Union.

THE GREEK'S PLEBISCITE VOTE showed an overwhelming majority in favor of the return to the throne of the former King Constantine. More than 90 per cent of the voters rallied to their former monarch, despite his alleged pro-German affiliations and inclinations. The action also was taken despite a general understanding that his return would prejudice the powers against Greece and might lead to a formal veto.

The dimensions of his victory undoubtedly modified any intention of the Allies, especially Great Britain and France, to take the drastic position indicated by pre-plebiscite utterances, such as withdrawal of all financial aid if Constantine were elected, and to call for payment of outstanding loans (this by France). The authorities at Athens, however, were at once given to understand that affairs would be closely watched.

Formal invitation to Constantine to return was long in issuing and did not go to him until the 11th. Meantime a slight reaction in favor of Venizelos had become noticeable in Athens, influenced possibly by clear indications that Hellenes in Turkey were decidedly hostile to the drift of home affairs.

The day he was elected Constantine said to an American interviewer:

My government will follow the foreign policy of Venizelos. It is ridiculous to allege otherwise, because the charge that I am pro-German I must stoutly repudiate. What if my wife is the Kaiser's sister? I did not marry her yesterday. We were married twenty-five years ago, when it was no crime to have a German wife. I am also first cousin to the late King Edward. Did that make me pro-British? Also I am a cousin of the late Russian emperor. But what of it? My policy never was pro-German, or anything but Greek.

Asked about the guaranties which it is reported the Allies have demanded from Greece for his return, Constantine said:

If the British and Greek interests in the Near East are identical, why not have confidence in my government? The Greek army will continue to enforce the Turkish treaty.

AN INTERESTING DETAIL of the effect of the election of Constantine was the immediate assembling of the Holy Synod and Lay Council of the State Church in an extraordinary session. These prelates and laymen, with the best national interests at heart, appealed to Constantine to abandon his claim to the throne, since his return would imperil the nation's good and jeopardize the future of Hellenism. They said that they hoped

that he would nominate Prince George as the occupant of the throne. From Lucerne, December 10, Constantine sent forth a special message to the people of the United States. He said:

I feel in duty bound to express to the great American people my most heartfelt thanks for the sympathy I received from them in my trials. I thank them also for the impartiality they certainly have endeavored to show in judging me and in criticising my attitude during the most disastrous war ever known in the history of mankind.

I, upon whose family crest stands the device, "The law of the people is my power," ever have had at heart the interest of the people by whom I am now called, by their express and indisputable will, to rule.

Mindful of the great upheaval the war was going to cause, I endeavored to follow a line of action which I considered would serve the best interests of my people, and I feel I did it with enmity toward none and good will toward all. The combination of circumstances all tended to make credible the calumnious reports that an alert and indefatigable statesman, who, unluckily, out of spite for me, had been blinded to all the dictates of reason, had caused to be spread sedulously abroad.

JAPAN'S PLEA FOR FORMAL RECOGNITION of the principle of racial equality in international negotiations and settlements, made at the Paris Peace Conference, was negatived. With the assembling in Geneva of the delegates to the League's popular body, one of the "ghosts" hovering in the background was Japan's probable strategy in reopening this issue. Would she force it at once? Would she bide her time and spring it at an hour when tactically she had the best chance of carrying her point? What would she do? She has not forced the issue. Instead, from representatives of the British dominions—Canada, Australia, and South Africa—there has come unequivocal reiteration of the position taken by Premier Hughes at the Paris Conference. Viscount Ishii, of the Japanese delegation, also has made the following memorable declaration, making it clear that for reasons of prudence and also of loyalty to the League Japan will not press the issue now, but will await a later day for final action by the League on the principle involved, its rejection or its affirmation. He said:

Japan had the opportunity, when the covenant originally was formulated, to declare her belief that equality before the law should be assured all men, irrespective of nationality, race, or religion.

That principle should be established, so that the various merits of mankind should be emancipated and given free play in the interest of human civilization. That principle of equal opportunity should be one of the bedrocks of the great peace organization in order that nationals owing allegiance to the League should, to a man, be loyally willing to make sacrifices in blood and treasure when the occasion arises, in order that all should know that the League unfailingly is for right and not for might, and in order that a lasting peace should be doubly assured.

It was to the poignant regret of the Japanese Government and people that the original framers of the covenant found themselves unable to accept the Japanese proposal in this matter. The Japanese delegates declared they would continue their insistence for the adoption of their just demands by the League in the future.

In view, however, of the present circumstances, Japan is strongly persuaded that the League is yet in a stage when consolidation of its organization and its actual working, based on the present covenant should be accorded greater attention and deeper deliberation than questions relating to fundamental principles, which might make for revision of the covenant, and deliberation of which should be deferred for some time.

From this point of view, Japan is refraining from making any concrete proposal in this Assembly as to the question of equal opportunity and treatment, and will patiently bide her time until the opportune moment shall present itself.

Asked by a *New York Evening Post* correspondent at Geneva as to just what he meant by the "opportune moment," Viscount Ishii said:

By opportune moment I mean when the time comes that our campaign of education in California, Canada, and Australia has succeeded and we have convinced the people of those countries that they have nothing to fear from Japan. We know your central government has sympathy in this matter with my government, but cannot act while prejudice continues in a part of the United (?) edice will cease in future because of our strict adherence to the agreement concerning labor and emigration. Then California will realize she has been oversuspicious and apprehensive. When that realization comes then it will be the opportune moment to appeal to the League for recognition of the equality of my race and the United States will support us.

The same also will be true for the same reasons in Canada, and even Australia, which is far more bitter against Japanese than either California or Canada. It was not President Wilson or Colonel House who denied our appeal for recognition when the covenant was first framed at Paris, but it was set aside because of the influence of British dominions.

IN PORTO RICO AND THE PHILIPPINES there are stirrings indicating that "self-determination" is an issue that the United States will have to face sooner or later in its dependencies. A letter from a resident in San Juan, Republican (United States), to Senator Harding, asking him for his views on Porto Rican independence, drew from him the following reply:

"MY DEAR MR. TODD:

"Thank you for writing me as you did on September 8. There has been more than one instance of the demand for independence of certain sections of our territory. History has shown clearly enough that these demands were founded on short-sighted policy, and that if autonomy had been obtained the result would have been the loss of those great benefits of protection, freedom, equality of opportunity, and prosperity which America has always brought to her component parts. If there is a minority opinion in Porto Rico for independence represented in a political party, I believe that it will not flourish long, because the wisdom of your people is too sound to even consider casting aside the ultimate welfare which flows from a unity with the American Republic.

"In all cases known to the past or the present, this unity and loyalty is based upon the good sense of men and women, watchful against demagoguery aimed at gaining untrammelled political power under so-called 'independence.' Often when in various corners of the world independence has been gained it has resulted in exploitation of the poor, in chaos, bankruptcy, and misfortune, brought on by the very same forces which led the demand for autonomy.



"I believe in the loyalty of the people of Porto Rico to the United States and in the loyalty of the United States to the people of Porto Rico.

"Very sincerely,

"WARREN G. HARDING."

ISAURO GABALDON, NEWLY ELECTED RESIDENT COMMISSIONER from the Philippines to the United States, on his arrival in Washington, early in October, said:

"It is of the utmost importance to continue friendly relations between the Philippines and the United States that Congress should take up the question of independence without further delay. The officials of the Philippines and the masses of the Filipino people are alike insistent that independence shall be granted. Equal protection will be given the rights and property of Americans and foreigners resident in the islands with that given to our own people. I wish to emphasize, the Filipino people have very friendly feelings toward the United States. We realize you have rendered us a great service in assisting us to prepare ourselves to take over the responsibilities that will come with independence. We are practically unanimous in desiring a Philippine republic."

THE WORLD STUDENT CHRISTIAN FEDERATION, at a recent meeting in Switzerland, had representatives of thirty-seven nations present. The conference was notable for several precedents established. Within its own ranks it plans to gather relief for the impoverished youth of the world seeking an education. Making less doctrinal its tests for membership and still asserting its reason for existence to be the evangelization of the student world and the spiritual culture of youth, the delegates, led by Mr. John R. Mott, nevertheless voted that there must be a forward step into the world of internationalism along quite new lines. Hereafter the Federation cannot be content to promote religious fellowship and co-operation between citizens of many nations, but it must positively assert itself in defining what political international relations should be and in seeing that they make for the coming of the Kingdom of Christ. This broadening scope of the Federation, it is admitted, is the direct result of the war upon leaders of the movement. They are finding that the youth with whom they have to deal now are realists, not romanticists, mystics, or pietists. They want States, as States, to begin to obey the Law and the Gospel.

THE Y. M. C. A. OF THE UNITED STATES is doing a larger relief and educational work in Europe, Asia, and Africa at the present time than most persons realize. Not less than 2,650,000 soldiers and sailors of non-American forces, as well as those of the home land, are getting the same service that was given prior to the armistice, but with such modifications as peace naturally suggests. To the Association also has been left much of the work among prisoners of war not yet repatriated. It is doing all this with a reduced staff, without any of the glamour of war attaching to the service, and at a time when neither volunteer nor paid helpers are as numerous as they were during the war. Seldom do any of the newly established governments make demands upon the Y. M. C. A. for such help as it may give without receiving an affirmative reply. In the United States the duty

has just been assumed of aiding the Bureau of Emigration of the Department of Labor to guard incoming immigrants from seductions of human leeches and breeders of social strife, and to aid them in reaching their destinations.

## BOOK REVIEWS

THE NEW WORLD ORDER—INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION, INTERNATIONAL LAW, INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION. By *Frederick Charles Hicks*. New York, Doubleday, Page & Co. 1920. Pp. viii + 496. \$3.00.

Here we have a book packed with facts and written by one versed as a briefer. The author is the law librarian of Columbia University, but he has done more than to "turn over half a library to make one book"; he has organized his informing data, until, with apologies to Hegel, his "creative synthesis" has given us something better than existed before.

There are 290 pages of text and 190 pages of appendices. The text is divided into three main divisions, dealing respectively with: 1, International Relations; 2, International Law; 3, International Co-operation. The appendices give us the most relevant parts of the peace treaty; the treaty establishing the Dual Alliance in 1879; the published sections of the treaty establishing the Triple Alliance, renewed finally in 1912; the French texts of the two papers relating to the Russo-French Alliance; the Holy Alliance Act; Central American treaties of 1907; the Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes; the draft convention relative to the creation of the Judicial Arbitration Court, and the convention relative to the creation of an International Prize Court, all taken from The Hague conventions and drafts of 1907; the treaty between the United States and Guatemala, 1913, and a bibliography. There is a respectable index.

Hence we have here an ambitious work; but a dip into its substance does not disappoint. It contains excellence. History in abundance falls before the author's power of analysis. Thus a service is rendered to the inquiring mind bent on knowing something of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

The early portions of the first chapter will bring the prejudice of many to the author's support at the outset. Like the men who gathered at The Hague in 1899 and in 1907, he recognizes in his beginning paragraphs "the solidarity uniting the members of the society of civilized nations." But a careful reading of the entire chapter reveals more caution than seems necessary. It may be true, as he says, that the society of civilized nations has no written covenant, no officers, no seat of government or administration; but The Hague conferences, with their statutes, their Court of Arbitration, and other organs, came nearer to being these things than the author seems to grant or realize. Instead of saying dogmatically that no world legislature "at any time has been in existence," he might have acknowledged more appropriately the quasi-legislative acts, say, of The Hague conferences. Indeed, he does grant in another connection (page 107): "In any case the work of the two Hague conferences and of the International Naval Conference ought not to be lost. In the light of a new and unparalleled experience, their product should be revised, if only to attempt anew to record the progress of custom and the common consent on which all international law is founded."

Many people will probably agree that the present League of Nations is "a new manifestation of the desire to give more definite organization to the existing Society of Nations upon which it is based and out of which it has grown." But all will not agree with "the author's personal conviction that the League of Nations should be supported not merely because it provides means for putting war a few steps farther in the background, but because it emphasizes the necessity for co-operation between sovereign States." This latter view is expressed only in the preface, however. In justice to the author, it must be granted that in the body of his text "the facts have been allowed to speak for themselves, opinions and prophecies rarely being hazarded."